



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,893	02/17/2004	George Xenakis	CE10902W	9642
23330	7590	12/10/2008		
MOTOROLA, INC. LAW DEPARTMENT 1303 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			EXAMINER SHAND, ROBERTA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.US@MOTOROLA.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,893

Applicant(s)

XENAKIS ET AL.

Examiner

Roberta A. Shand

Art Unit

2416

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/17/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn, and a new final is issued

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Creamer (U.S. 8200400 B2).

3. Regarding claim 1, the admitted prior art teaches (fig. 1) in a communication system a method for routing bearer traffic between a 3G network and a 2G network, the method for routing bearer traffic comprising the steps of: determining by a first network a local gateway in proximity to a calling party.

4. The admitted prior art does not teach if a calling party is roaming into a first network, determining by the first network a local gateway of the first network and in proximity to a calling party; and sending the bearer traffic by the first network to the local gateway; and directly routing the bearer traffic from the local gateway to a second network in proximity to a called party.

5. Creamer teaches (fig. 1) if a calling party is roaming into a first network (wireless network 105, Creamer teaches roaming between a mobile network – conventional cellular telephony network or a PCS and a wireless network – TCP/IP over 802.11), determining by the first network a local gateway of the first network and in proximity to a calling party (col. 6, line 57 – col. 7, line 3); and sending the bearer traffic by the first network to the local gateway; and directly routing the bearer traffic from the local gateway to a second network in proximity to a called party (col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the admitted prior art to include Creamer's roaming method to ensure quality of service within the system allowing a mobile to freely roam between a mobile network and a wireless network without the call being dropped (col. 1, lines 39-43).
6. Regarding claims 2 and 12, Creamer teaches (col. 4, lines 14-32) there is further included a step of determining a location of the called party.
7. Regarding claims 3 and 13, the admitted prior art teaches the first network includes the 2G network currently serving the calling party.
8. Regarding claims 4 and 14, the admitted prior art teaches the second network includes the 3G network currently serving the called party.

9. Regarding claims 5 and 15, the admitted prior art teaches the first network includes the 3G network currently serving the calling party.

10. Regarding claims 6 and 16, the admitted prior art teaches the second network includes the 2G network currently serving the called party.

11. Regarding claims 7 and 11, Creamer teaches (fig. 2) the step of directly routing the bearer traffic includes a step of inhibiting transmission of the bearer traffic to a home gateway, if the calling party is roaming (Creamer teaches selecting a gateway based on the location of the device which means if the party is roaming the home agent won't be selected therefore inhibiting transmission to the home gateway).

12. Regarding claims 8 and 17, the admitted prior art teaches routing the bearer traffic from the local gateway through an inter-connect network between the first and second networks to the called party.

13. Regarding claim 9, the admitted prior art teaches (fig. 1) a method for routing bearer traffic between a first network and a second network, the method for routing bearer traffic comprising the steps of: determining by the first network a local gateway in proximity to a calling party;

14. The admitted prior art does not teach if a calling party is roaming into a first network, determining by the first network a local gateway of the first network and in proximity to a calling

party; and sending the bearer traffic by the first network to the local gateway; and directly routing the bearer traffic from the local gateway to a second network in proximity to a called party.

15. Creamer teaches (fig. 1) if a calling party is roaming into a first network (wireless network 105, Creamer teaches roaming between a mobile network – conventional cellular telephony network or a PCS and a wireless network – TCP/IP over 802.11), determining by the first network a local gateway of the first network and in proximity to a calling party (col. 6, line 57 – col. 7, line 3); and sending the bearer traffic by the first network to the local gateway; and directly routing the bearer traffic from the local gateway to a second network in proximity to a called party (col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the admitted prior art to include Creamer's roaming method to ensure quality of service within the system allowing a mobile to freely roam between a mobile network and a wireless network without the call being dropped (col. 1, lines 39-43).

16. Regarding claim 10, Creamer teaches (fig. 2) there is further included a step of sending the bearer traffic by the first network to the local gateway.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment filed June 4, 2008 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta A. Shand whose telephone number is 571-272-3161. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am-5:30pm.

21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

22. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roberta A. Shand
/R. A. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/FIRMIN BACKER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416